

WITH FACES TO THE ENEMY.

Liberals Will Not be Hounded Out of Office.

COL. GIBSON'S ADDRESS.

Will Stand By His Leader Through the Fight.

Junction Pool-room — Government Not in a Position to Cancel Charter—Mr. St. John Attacks Mr. Davis.

Hon. Colonel Gibson concluded his address to the Legislature yesterday, speaking for an hour, and finishing with an eloquent declaration of his determination to stand by his leader, and of the Government's intention to continue in the trust imposed upon them, and if they had to retire, to do so with their faces to the enemy, not as cowards and traitors to their party. The Conservatives, moreover, would possibly find that the tide would turn, the Government's ill-luck would change, and the Opposition, after being so near to their desired haven, find themselves still farther away. He also explained that the Government was not in a position to cancel the charter of the Toronto Junction Recreation Club. If illegal practices were proved the Government might do so, but the Government was not constituted for trying informations for breaches of the law. The courts were for that purpose. Mr. St. John followed Colonel Gibson, and spoke for an hour and a half before moving the adjournment. He criticized Premier Ross for not appearing in the witness box in the Gamey case, and Mr. Ross interrupted to make a statement on the subject, explaining his course. He had been ready to attend the court at any moment if called upon. Mr. St. John then took up the action of Hon. E. J. Davis regarding his resignation, and drew from the Commissioner a full explanation. The House rose shortly before 6. Mr. M. G. Cameron, West Huron, is expected to follow Mr. St. John, and Mr. A. A. Mahaffy, Muskoka, will probably follow him.

The Attorney-General Continues.

Hon. J. M. Gibson, resuming his speech at 3.25 o'clock, said that it had been claimed that the Government should cancel the Toronto Junction Recreation Club's charter. "So we should if illegal practices are once established. But the hon. gentlemen says the Government should try them. I do not think that the Government should. The Government is not constituted for the purpose of trying informations for breaches of the laws of the country. There are courts for that purpose and there are juries for that purpose, and though we may have a suspicion that this or that nefarious or illegal practice is being carried on here or there or elsewhere, no Government would be justified in assuming that that could be taken as fact and act upon the strength of suspicion. I do not think that on any reasonable consideration of the situation anyone will seriously argue that although there is suspicion and it is common report that illegal practice is being

done in this or that institution, the Government should step in and say it is reported so and so, your charter is cancelled. The rights that you are supposed to enjoy under it are taken away from you. Such a proposition as that, if once admitted, could be carried to an absurd limit. It would be a most unsafe power to entrust to any Government, and I am sure that if my hon. friend ever is entrusted with the responsibility of government he will appreciate the difficulty of assuming any such responsibility as that."

The West Elgin Commission.

It was the practice of the hon. gentleman opposite to bring up at every possible occasion old and groundless charges. West Elgin was frequently heard about. His hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, had on one occasion assumed that the commission to try these charges was really appointed to shield criminality. He charged the Government with appointing Judges for the purpose of shielding criminality. That was little short of charging the Judges with shielding criminality themselves.

Mr. Whitney—I never uttered a word with relation to the West Elgin enormity that I am not more and more convinced every day was justified, and I have never said anywhere that the Government were concerned in the burning of the ballots. My hon. friend ought to know that. I have accused them of almost everything else, though, in relation to the West Elgin matter, and I do so now.

Presumptions of Guilt.

Colonel Gibson—That appears very much like saying, "I do not accuse you of being guilty because I cannot prove it, but you are guilty all the same." If I am accused of nearly everything else but that—and he says I am—then I might as well also be accused of that. It reminds me a good deal of a passage in the Life of Gladstone by Mr. Morley. It applied to the hon. gentleman's assumption of guilt on my part without trial, and also applied very strongly to the Provincial Secretary, who, of course, everyone knew, was guilty according to the hon. gentleman. Writing of the case of the Irish and the home rule question, Mr. Morley said, "Everything was being presumed against the Irish. Everything that was not to be proved against the Irishman was assumed against him." Not proven was treated as only an evasive form of guilty. If the three Judges found that there was no evidence that the accused had done this thing or that, yet it was held legitimate to argue that evidence must exist if only it could be found. (Government applause.)

They were not all Irish in the Government, though they were to a certain extent home rulers, and the hon. gentleman would probably be satisfied with nothing else than that everything else should be assumed against them. That was a general principle to start in with. Of course there was a British maxim that the person must be presumed to be innocent until proven guilty, but that was an old, archaic and exploded doctrine. How admirably the quotation fitted in with the code of ethics that hon. gentlemen had adopted.

Fighting the Presbyterians.

Those were not the arguments that should be used by people who had a machine such as that now at work in North Oxford. Schools of instruction were even said to exist in Toronto for ballot manipulation.

Mr. St. John—The hon. gentleman probably knows more about that than we do.

Col. Gibson—The only thing I know is that instructions were overheard being given in this city, and not under Liberal auspices. There were said to be thirty or forty men in North Oxford, most of whom had never appeared on a public platform.

Mr. St. John denied the truth of this.

Col. Gibson — I may, per